DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 447 UD 016 805

AUTHOR	Hedley, Carolyn N.
TITLE	Creative Reading Program at Children's Art Carnival; September 1974 -June 1975.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE	Jun 75
NOTE	38p.; New York City Board of Education Evaluation Report, Function No. B/E 09-59635; Best Copy Available
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Aesthetic Education; *Art Activities; *Art Expression; Communication Skills; Creative Reading; *Elementary Education; Grade 2; Grade 3; Grade 4; Individualized Instruction; *Reading Centers; Reading Improvement; Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

One hundred eight children in grades two to four (ages 7 to 10) whose reading level was one to two years below grade level participated in this program. The Creative Reading Program for the Children's Art Carnival funded under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Title I had as its purpose the teaching of reading and other communication skills by using the aesthetic experience as the foundation of reading-language instruction. The Carnival provided an individualized reading program which related each child's developmental pattern as it was revealed in art workshops to a reading plan especially designed for the student. There were three, 12 week sessions in the Carnival. The students met twice a week at the Carnival Center where a small reading laboratory existed. These students met with the reading improvement teacher three times a week in their respective schools. At these in-school reading laboratories, the children worked in small groups on reading-communication skills in activities and study sessions that were based on the art experienced at the Children's Art Carnival. The Carnival program supplemented the regular school program by offering indivudalized one-to-one instruction which provided a choice of ways to learn reading. Findings indicated that the Carnival Program was successful. The children evidenced a great deal of personal and attitudinal affective development according to Psychological Center personnel. They progressed in reading and linguistic achievement as measured on the Prescriptive Reading Inventory. (Author/AM)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED137447

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. B/E 09-59635

CREATIVE READING PROGRAM AT CHILDREN'S ART CARNIVAL

September 1974 - June 1975

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Carolyn N. Hedley

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 016805

An evaluation of a New York City School district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1974-75 school year.

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
II.	EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	3
III.	FINDINGS	5
IV.	SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	11
APPENDICES		14

Final Report
July 1975

TITLE I, ESEA 1974-75
Function # B/E 09-59635

EVALUATION OF THE CREATIVE READING PROGRAM AT THE CHILDREN'S ART CARNIVAL

I. THE PROGRAM

The Creative Reading Program for the Children's Art Carnival has as its purpose the teaching of reading and other communication skills by using the aesthetic experience as the foundation of reading-language instruction. The Carnival provides a highly individualized reading program which relates to each child's developmental pattern as it is revealed in art workshops to a reading plan especially designed for the student. Children who are involved in a personally expressive program in the arts are often motivated to communicate and to seek information from the written word. The workshops include painting, print making, puppetry, sculpture and animated film making. Reading activities, books and newspapers are built around the art activity of each child.

The Subjects in the Program: One hundred eighty (180) Title I eligible children in grades 2-4 (ages 7 to 10) reading one to two years below grade level were selected to participate in the program. A classroom teacher accompanied the students to and from the program, which met on Mondays and Wednesdays for 12 weeks. A Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw Hill) and the Metropolitan Achievement Test (New York City Reading Test) were

used for selection of the students, along with recommendations of the teacher, the guidance counselors, the principals and parents. Children were able to be drawn from any one of the Title I districts in New York City. Enrollment was voluntary on the part of the teacher.

Participant Staff: The staff for the program included one teacher assigned as a coordinator, and two reading improvement teachers who worked two days a week at the Carnival Center and three days each at the school site. On all occasions, the reading improvement teachers and the coordinating teacher were actively involved in teaching reading skills to the children in the program. Five teacher-artists were responsible each for one of the art workshops (puppetry, film making, sculpture, painting, print making, and audio-visual activities and recordings). The teacher-artists were responsible for planning and setting up the activities as well as record-keeping and the recording of each child's activities. These teacher-artists were hired on a part-time basis.

Program Activities: There were three, 12-week sessions in the Children's Art Carnival, where each class participated on a 12-week basis. The students met twice a week at the Carnival Center where a small reading laboratory existed. These students met with the reading improvement teacher three times a week in their respective Public Schools. At these in-school reading laboratories, the children worked in small groups on reading-communication skills in activities and study sessions that were predicated on the art experiences at the Children's Art Carnival. Numerous plays, poems story books, radio programs, etc. were

developed at the in-school center by the reading improvement teacher, in cooperation with the classroom teacher. The Carnival Program supplemented the regular school program by offering individualized one-to-one instruction which provided a choice of ways to learn reading.

Program Facilities: The program at the Children's Art Carnival itself was housed in a renovated brownstone near City College. In the building were story telling centers, several art workshops, film making facilities, dark rooms, viewing rooms for films and plays, and a backyard where many activities, such as puppet shows, videotapes, and film making, were carried on. Offices and staff meeting rooms were on the second floor. A reading center and activity area were on the lower floor. Conference rooms, which were brightly painted, were there also.

At the public school where the reading improvement teacher held forth three times each week, a room was provided which was often shared with another activity, such as band or French lessons. These other activities were carried on before and after school. Some of the children's work was displayed here and a mini-library was set up to house Carnival materials and books.

II. EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

The basic object of the project was to develop basic reading skills, creative thinking, and linguistics competence in retarded readers. The evaluation attempted to measure only the extent to which children improved in reading skills and linguistics competencies as a result of attending the Carnival. To accomplish

this last objective, students were administered the McGraw Hill Prescriptive Reading Inventory, a criterion referenced test which describes the degree to which children are improving on specific reading skills. In addition, all children were given the Metropolitan Achievement Test and the New York City Reading Test, which rendered a standardized score. The Prescriptive Reading Inventory was given in addition to the regular reading tests inasmuch as the program did not last a full year, but only 12 weeks.

In addition to the tests used, a questionnaire was developed for less formal evaluation. The questionnaire provides for an extensive survey for the evaluation director, as well as interview forms for the project directors, the teachers, the aides and the students in the program. Final informal evaluation was done by means of an evaluation form which was administered to all participants in the program -- the director, the teachers and the students themselves.

Finally, a great deal of on-project evaluation was done by the teachers, who used logs and videotapes to analyze their own and student performance. Once a week, the staff of the program, including a staff of psychologists from City College, gathered in order to improve instruction and to discuss individual student development and problems. This self-evaluation was one of the most valuable parts of the program, in that the group was constantly providing feed-back for its own improvement and that of the students. The psychological team was led by a renowned Swiss educator, Dr. Gilbert Voyat, who has worked with Dr. Jean Piaget; their

efforts aided the teachers to understand and anticipate student behaviors and problems.

III. FINDINGS

The Creative Reading Program of the Children's Art Carnival functioned very much as it was described in the proposal. The children appeared delighted to be in a less institutional setting. They enjoyed participation in a program that was distinct from the activities of the school including an art laboratory and a reading center for instruction and for conferences. Ninety per cent of the 180 participants received all of the tests; attendance was high; the teachers, both at the public school and at the art center, were enthusiastic. Principals wrote letters wholeheartedly endorsing the program. The director was careful to follow all of the guidelines. Job descriptions were carefully adhered to, with each participant on the staff carrying out assigned responsibilities.

The creative efforts of the children were displayed in the public school rooms and halls and in the Reading Center at each school. Near the Children's Art Carnival street decorations were made for the various holidays. The children produced many booklets of stories and poems. They kept notebooks and logs of their work. They wrote a story about each of their creative efforts. The teachers in the program developed vocabulary and narratives about each project that was done with the children.

Test Results: The results of this program were evidenced in the test results of the Prescriptive Reading Inventory (McGraw

Hill). The Prescriptive Reading Inventory (PRI), Level A, was administered to the second grade children, and Level B was administered to the third through fifth grade children (age ten) at the beginning of the program. The post-test was administered 12 weeks later at the end of the program. Pre-test and post-test raw scores were analyzed for significant differences by correlated t-tests. The results were highly significant. (See Table 1). Except for the third grade, which had a very small number in the sample, all of the grades showed significant improvement at the .01 level of significance. Statistical analysis indicated that during the duration of their participation in the Creative Reading Program at the Children's Art Carnival, the children improved significantly in reading and linguistic skills.

TABLE 1

Analysis of the Prescriptive Reading Inventory

Grade & Test	N	Pre-T Mean	SD	Post-T Mean	SD	t
Grade 2 .PRI (A)	27	62.00	25.80	88.03	18.45	8.33**
Grade 3 .PRI (B)	13	35.31	7.35	34.85	8.94	0.35
Grade 4 .PRI (B)	95	49.89	17.82	58.95	18.99	9.98**
Grade 5 .PRI (B)	21	49.43	16.50	61.76	12.12	5.15**

** Significant at the .01 level.

Of the 180 children in the program, only 156 were tested. Reasons for lack of testing were: four children were being tested for CRMD; five children were absent due to illness; three children were absent for truancy; eight children transferred to other schools (if a child was transferred in the beginning of the 12 weeks, a new child entered the program which accounts for the extra children); four children were unable to complete the test; three children were unable to speak English; one child had a nervous breakdown due to home problems; one child was discharged from the program and two children became so emotionally upset during the test that they were unable to take it.

As the program progressed through the year and each new class of students arrived, the teachers seemed to organize their lessons, the activities, the reading assignments and the culminating effort with more thoroughness and more insight into the children's learning. This experience was aided by the psychological team affiliated with City University. By the end of the year, the students' work was more sophisticated due to the greater experience of the teachers. Finally, the Children's Art Carnival developed a brochure which was sent to the participating schools.

The reaction of each participating group of the staff and the evaluators in the program varied. Following is a discussion of the various points of view regarding the program; these views were gleaned from observation by the evaluator, by interviews, by questionnaires and by evaluation check-lists.

Director Reaction: The directors included not only the Board of Education Teacher-Director, but the Art Carnival Director and

the Psychological Team Director. All of these persons regarded the program highly; they felt that often dramatic personal and psychological change occurred while the children were in the program. Some children developed from non-speaking to more participating behaviors; they saw the children as actively participating in the creative process and developing personal, creative swlf-awareness. Indeed, at the beginning of the program, there was less concern with the reading aspect of the program than with the affective behaviors and attitudes that were emerging in some of the children. This reaction to watching the children prosper was fostered in the weekly staff meetings, which often lasted three hours. There was high staff interaction and high staff morale throughout the program. Much of this enthusiasm was carried into the schools by the participating teacher and the in-school reading improvement teacher -- often referred to as the "story-maker" who listened to and wrote many of the children's activities and ideas with regard to Carnival Activity.

The respective directors recommended that there be more attention given to the purposeful working toward culminating activities and that there be more culminating participation of the students in the final days of Carnival participation. Directors would like to have more parent participation, and increased visual presentation of the children's work. It was noted that the program would be more beneficial if it were extended to a full semester's work. The time allotments do not fall in programatically with other school activities. Staggered attendance would allow the full complement of students to be

served. Fifth graders (eleven years of age) should be included in the program.

Teacher Reaction: The teachers were much in favor of continuing the program. They particularly liked the video-taping aspect of the program, and they would like to have more replay of the video-taped sessions for children's viewing. The teacher evaluations included not only those of the regular classroom teacher, but the Carnival artist-teachers and the reading improvement teachers as well. The teachers agreed that it was beneficial to the children to be away from the school setting, participating in an activity program which was located in a brownstone with a large backyard, quite unlike the usual learning environment of the school.

The teachers recommended that some kind of simplified criterion test be used for the children -- one that would have fewer items, such as the Pope Inventory or the Stanford Diagnostic. The length of the test caused irritation and frustration to the administrator of the test and to the students. Finally, during the last two sessions, the classroom teacher gave the pre- and post-tests, so that the Carnival staff would not be identified with the test-giving activities and thus "turn off" the children to the program.

Student Reaction: Student reaction to the program was highly enthusiastic. They all participated in all of the various workshops and simply wanted more of the same. They wanted more time to work with puppets, more film making so that they could make "Karate movies", or more time to work with the clay. Several

mentioned that they enjoyed the personal sessions in the reading laboratory at the Art Carnival. On the negative side, they wanted more order in the halls and stairways, more clothing hooks, more art facilities and materials for jewelry-making sessions as well.

Evaluator Reaction: The exuberance of all the persons in the program was notable. Students and staff alike maintained high morale and high dedication to one another and to the program. The children were selected from poverty areas. The Carnival presence seemed to have a benevolent effect in its immediate locality. Street art and community participation caused a camaraderie among the inhabitants of Hamilton Terrace that was not observed elsewhere in the 145th Street area. It seemed to the evaluator that stronger ties could be developed with the school in terms of providing teachers, principals, parents and children with more of the advantages of the program and with the part that they should play in the program. Parents should be encouraged to visit the Carnival Center. Children should do more presentations at the school itself as well as at the center. A stronger support system for the reading improvement teachers should be maintained at the schools. This could be achieved through an effort at greater educational information regarding the program and kinds of liaisons that could be worked out with the Carnival. At times, the regular teachers did not release the children promptly to participate in the in-school program and the Art Carnival activity. The commute was too long in some cases and took up "school time". Again, the testing program might be re-thought.

The adult-student ratio seemed to be helpful to the children and should be maintained.

IV. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From nearly every kind of reaction the Creative Reading Program at the Children's Art Carnival is an astounding success. Evaluations of directors, teachers, collaborating personnel in the schools, and students in the program were nearly unanimous in their enthusiastic endorsement of the program. Statistical analysis was no less supportive in providing information regarding the success of the program. The results were significant at the highest level, with the exception of a very small group of thirteen participating third graders. The children evidenced a great deal of personal and attitudinal affective development, according to the Psychological Center personnel. They progressed in reading and linguistic achievement as measured on the Prescriptive Reading Inventory as well. It is the recommendation that the program be refunded and retained, as well as expanded.

Recommendations: The following recommendations are suggested for recycling the program for the 1975-76 School Year:

(1) Good rapport and high morale of the staff are in part due to the support staff of the Psychological Center. This component should be written into the program and supported by it.

(2) The children should not be brought from long distances to the Carnival. Commutes of over 20 minutes to a half-hour should not be made. Instead, Carnival Centers should be opened in other boroughs so that cultural centers and activities would be nearby.

(3) More liaison work with the schools should be done. This was suggested in last year's evaluation, but even more effort in public relations would be helpful. Public schools personnel do not fully understand the program nor the role that they play in it. More brochures and more activities originating in the Carnival should be seen and heard in the schools. The Carnival should provide some of its "shows" for viewing for the rest of the children in the public schools. A stronger support system in the schools for the reading improvement teacher would probably result from such an effort.

(4) Culminating activities should receive more attention, and in connection with Recommendation 3, should be seen out-of-Carnival.

(5) The Prescriptive Reading Inventory is helpful in that it directs teacher instruction, but it is a long, cumbersome test (27 pages) and is difficult for the children and their teachers to endure. Perhaps some other diagnostic instrument which defines the reading task in terms of skills, such as the Pope Inventory or the Stanford Diagnostic Test could be used.

(6) More parent participation should be encouraged. Parents could easily accompany children on the trip to the Carnival.

(7) Longer teaching sessions with one less public school tutoring session per week would fit semester schedules of the teaching year and give greater psychological benefit to the children in terms of staff relations and continuity.

(8) The testing program should end in early or mid-June. It is nearly impossible to meet Board of Education deadlines when children are still in the program on the last day of school.

(9) Supplies should be more abundant and a greater variety of materials should be used.

(10) Fifth graders, 11 years of age, should be included in the program. It seems that older students especially benefit from the program.

CREATIVE READING PROGRAM AT THE CHILDREN'S ART CARNIVAL

Function # B/E 09-59635

Use Table 30C. for norm referenced achievement data not applicable to tables 30A. and 30B.

30C. Standardized Test Results

In the table below, enter the requested information about the tests used to evaluate the effectiveness of major project components/activities in achieving desired objectives. Before completing this form, read all footnotes. Attach additional sheets if necessary.

Component Code	Activity Code	Test Used[1]	Form		Level		Total N[2]	Group ID[3]	Number Tested		Pretest			Posttest			Statistical Data		
			Pre	Post	Pre	Post			N[4]	Score Type[5]	Date	Mean	SD[6]	Date	Mean	SD[6]	Test[7]	Value[8]	Level[9]
603 13	720	PRI (73)	I	I	A	A	32	Gr. 2	27	6	Dec. 74	62.0	25.3	Mar 75	88.0	18.5	t	8.33	p ≤ .01
608 14	720	PRI (73)	I	I	B	B	18	Gr. 3	13	6	Mar. 75	35.3	7.4	June 75	34.9	8.9	t	0.35	n.s.
608 14	720	PRI (73)	I	I	B	B	111	Gr. 4	95	6	Sept. 74	40.9	17.8	June 75	59.0	19.0	t	9.98	p ≤ .01*
608 14	720	PRI (73)	I	I	B	B	27	Gr. 5	21	6	Sept. 74	49.4	16.5	Nov. 74	61.8	12.1	t	5.15	p ≤ .01

1/ Identify Test Used and Year of Publication (MAT-58; CAT-70, etc.)
2/ Total number of participants in the activity
3/ Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 5). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
4/ Total number of participants included in the pre and post test calculations.
5/ 1 = grade equivalent; 2 = percentile rank; 3 = Z Score; 4 = Standard score (publisher's); 5 = stanine; 6 = raw score; 7 = other.
6/ S.D. = Standard Deviation
7/ Test statistic (e.g., t; F; X^2).
8/ Obtained value
9/ Specify level of statistical significance obtained (e.g., $p \leq .05$; $p \leq .01$).

* Fourth graders participated in all three sessions throughout the year from September, 1974 to June, 1975

20. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2104	Medial Consonant	McGraw Hill	Green	60814		1	26	14	12
2105	Final Consonants and blends	"	"	"		24	17	14	3
2106	Vowels Single letters	"	"	"		4	52	23	29
2107	Vowels; more than 1 letter	"	"	"		16	40	25	15
2110	Rhyming words	"	"	"		26	44	28	16
2303	Homonyms	"	"	"		10	17	13	4
2401	Reality&Fantasy	"	"	"		6	21	8	13
2406	Main Idea	"	"	"		4	25	8	17
2409	Sequence	"	"	"		12	16	7	9
2411	Author's Purpose and techniques	"	"	"		12	31	17	14
2412	Setting and Charac. analysis	"	"	"		39	60	27	33

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.

2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2102	Initial Consonants & Blnds	McGraw Hill	Red	60813		13	24	18	6
2104	Final Consonants	"	"	"		13	24	18	6
2206	Prepositions Phrases	"	"	"		16	21	13	8
2301	Antonyms	"	"	"		19	18	18	0
2303	Homonyms	"	"	"		14	23	17	6
2403	Inferences Cause & effect	"	"	"		6	31	17	14
2404	Facts & Details	"	"	"		10	27	14	13
2407	Picture Clues	"	"	"		14	23	16	7
2408	Drawing Conclus.	"	"	"		9	28	14	14
2412	Setting & Charac. Analysis	"	"	"		11	26	18	8

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp.2-4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

29

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils Passing (1)	Pretest No. of Pupils Failing (2)	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	Posttest No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2106	Vowels Single letters	McGraw Hill	Red	60814	B	8	13	5	8
2207	Sentence Structure	"	"	"	"	5	16	5	11
2301	Antonyms	"	"	"	"	12	9	4	5
2403	Inference Cause & Effect	"	"	"	"	7	14	8	6
2404	Facts & Detail	"	"	"	"	8	13	9	6
2406	Main Idea	"	"	"	"	5	16	7	9
2412	Setting & Charac. Analysis	"	"	"	"	6	15	7	8

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.

2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as B) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

30. Criterion Referenced Test Results: In the table below, enter the requested information about criterion referenced test results used to evaluate the effectiveness of short treatments (less than 60 hours) in reading or mathematics. Use the instructional objective codes provided on pp. 2 - 4 of the instruction manual. Provide only those instructional objective codes which were addressed by the treatment and provide separate data for each test used and each level tested. Use additional sheets if necessary. Record in columns 2, 3 and 4 only those participants who completed both tests.

Code	Instructional Objective	Publisher	Level	Component Code 1/	Subgroup 2/	Pretest No. of Pupils		Posttest	
						Passing (1)	Failing (2)	No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Passing	No. of Pupils from Col. 2 Failing
2104	Final Consonants and blends	McGraw Hill	Green	60813		5	13	7	6
2107	Vowels; more than 1 letter	"	"	"		2	16	8	8
2110	Rhyming words	"	"	"		4	14	8	6
2304	Synonyms	"	"	"		5	13	8	5
2412	Setting & Charac. analysis	"	"	"		6	12	8	4

1/ Indicate the component code used in previous sections of this report used to describe treatment and population.
2/ Provide data for the following groups separately: Neglected (code as N), Delinquent (code as D), Bilingual code as L) and Handicapped (code as H). Place the indicated code letter in the last column to signify the subgroup evaluated.

29

-9-

OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION - DATA LOSS FORM

(attach to MIR, item #30) Function # B/E 09-59635

In this table enter all data loss information. Between MIR, item #30 and this form, all participants in each activity must be accounted for. The component and activity codes used in completion of item #30 should be used here so that the two tables match. See definitions below table for further instructions.

Component Code	Activity Code	(1) Group I.D.	(2) Test Used	(3) Total N	(4) Number Tested/ Analyzed	(5) Participants Not Tested/ Analyzed		(6) Reasons why students were not tested, or if tested, were not analyzed	
						N	%		Number/ Reason
6 0 8 1 3	7 2 0	Gr. 2	PRI (73)	32	27	5	18	Moved - 1; Absent - 3 Tested for CRMD - 2	
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0	Gr. 3	PRI (73)	18	13	5	27	Absent - 5	
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0	Gr. 4	PRI (73)	111	95	16	14	Non-English speaking - 2 Absent - 8; Truant - 2 Nervous breakdown-1; Moved-2 Discharged-1; Emotionally upset -2	
6 0 8 1 4	7 2 0	Gr. 5	PRI (73)	27	21	6	22	Moved - 4; Absent - 2	

(1) Identify the participants by specific grade level (e.g., grade 3, grade 9). Where several grades are combined, enter the last two digits of the component code.
(2) Identify the test used and year of publication (MAT-70, SDAT-74, etc.).
(3) Number of participants in the activity.
(4) Number of participants included in the pre and posttest calculations found on item #30.
(5) Number and percent of participants not tested and/or not analyzed on item #30.
(6) Specify all reasons why students were not tested and/or analyzed. For each reason specified, provide a separate number count. If any further documentation is available, please attach to this form. If further space is needed to specify and explain data loss, attach additional pages to this form.

CAROLYN HEDLEY
Fordham University
School of Education

CHILDREN'S ART CARNIVAL EVALUATION

Logistics:

Evaluation of _____ Component

School: _____

Address: _____

Times to Observe: _____

Week Days to Observe: _____

Teacher in Charge: _____

Logistical Considerations

As Evaluator:

I went to the location indicated above on the date listed on my estimated schedule. Before going to the school where I was observing, I phoned the Coordinator. Upon arriving, I stopped by the school office to notify the Director of my arrival and to receive directions for finding the Project.

When I reached the component I was to observe, I was friendly, but business-like. I talked with students, teacher and aides, when it was possible in an informal way. I did not conduct these interviews in the classroom, or without consent of the head of the department.

I filled in student, teacher/staff interviews when it was possible and appropriate. Some of these questions were filled in by me informally after the visit or some were filled in by the participants in the program themselves. When "forms" became a threat, I did not use them, but filled them in as soon after the visit as possible. If the teachers listed did not wish to be observed, or the supervisor of the program did not wish me to visit the classes, I conformed with their feelings.

Above all, I sought to keep good rapport with the personnel in the program.

Carolyn N. Hedley
Evaluation Director

EVALUATION OF THE PROJECT

School: _____

Coordinator: _____

Teacher: _____

Grade levels of children in the class: _____

Auxiliary personnel in class, or helping _____

Nearby: _____

Number of children in classes: _____

Boys _____ Girls _____

Boys _____ Girls _____

Student-adult ratio _____

Ethnic groups in class: Negro _____ Spanish-speaking _____

Oriental _____ Other _____

Number of personnel in program (usually remains constant after 1st visit)

_____

Supervisors _____ Assistants _____

Teachers _____ Secretaries _____

Aides _____ Other _____

What is the teacher turn-over in the school?

What is the student turn-over in the school?

Observer: _____ Day of Week _____

Date: _____ Hours: _____

Evaluator: _____

OBSERVATION IN CLASS

Community:

General impression of the neighborhood:

Housing:

Ethnicity: Negro _____ Spanish-speaking _____

Oriental _____ Other _____

Impression of persons who were visible in the neighborhood:

School:

General impression of the school:

Reaction to the personnel who aided you in finding your assignment:

Reaction to the congeniality toward learning with regard to physical facilities, materials, etc.

Classroom:

General description of the program:

General impression of teacher style:

General impression of the children's attitudes:

General impression of facilities and materials:

Kinds of grouping and types of study and instruction evident:

Innovative techniques and innovative materials observed:
(List all materials by name which you thought useful.)

Role of teacher aids during your visit:

List all the materials and methods used in the program on a separate page.

Diary of visit and casual observations: (continued on back of page)

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION FROM THE OBSERVATION: PROJECT EVALUATOR

To be used in the Narrative Report required by the State Education Department.

1. Are the objectives of the program being met?

2. What are the outstanding contributors to the achievement of the objectives of the project?

3. Describe why or how the features are contributing so effectively to the achievement of the objectives.

4. If any of the objectives are not being met, summarize the probable causes.

5. What unexpected outcomes are being achieved by the project? How did they occur?

6. Summarize your recommendations to improve or redesign the project in the next year's operation.

7. What practical advice or suggestions will help in establishing a similar project, especially with regard to administration and personnel?

8. Describe effective practices developed by the program which are being integrated into the regular school program.

INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER/COORDINATOR

Name _____

1. What do you feel are the greatest strengths of this program?

2. How would you change it next year to elaborate on what you have already done?

3. What is the method that you use for guiding teacher aids to help you in the program?

4. What are the materials and techniques that you feel are most effective in the program in terms of:

   a. Listening

   b. Oral language

   c. Written language

   d. Comprehension of Concept in

      *Reading

      *Mathematics

      *Science

      *Social Science

      *Other

   e. Learning skills -- learning rate

   f. Interest and enthusiasm for the program

5. What materials, techniques developed by you and your staff have proved effective?

INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER/COORDINATOR (cont.)

The following questions are listed to comply with the guidelines for the narrative report mandated by the State Education Department.

1. Has the population served by the program changed markedly since this project first began? (A) With regard to achievement level? (B) Disability level? (C) Poverty level? (D) Emotional difficulties level? (E) Ethnic differences? (F) Which children are eligible for this program? (G) How does selection occur?

2. How does this program integrate with the other subjects taught in the school?

3. How do other programs benefit from the personnel and programs and materials used in your project?

4. Have the objectives of the program changed since its inception? (A) What are these new objectives? (B) Are they being measured and met? (C) Why did you decide to change some objectives?

INTERVIEW WITH TEACHER AIDS:

1. What do you like the best about this program?

2. Can you see the youngsters are doing better now that they are here?

3. Next year, what would you like to do, if anything, to try out new ideas?

4. How do you know what to do or to teach every day?

5. What materials work out best for:

   a. Helping children to listen better?

   b. Helping children speak more?

   c. Helping them to learn and to know words?

   d. Helping them to hear the sounds in words?

   e. Helping keep up their interest and enthusiasm in the program?

6. Have you tried out any new ideas of your own, with the permission of the teacher, to help the children learn to read?

INTERVIEW WITH STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM:

This interview should be left unstructured, but one might ask questions such as the following: How do you like the program here? Do you have a good time? Are you learning quite a bit about reading? How do you like all the things that you have here, which help you to learn? Did you know your teacher before you came to this class? Does she live near you? Do you think that you will sign up again next year? Let's see what you are doing now.

Short anecdote of any interviews with youngsters:

FINAL EVALUATION FORM

To be filled out by all participants in the program if possible. Please check list below as to the nature of your status in the program:

____Director
____Advisor
____Consultant
____Support Staff
____Teacher
____Teacher Assistant
____Teacher Aide
____Student

____Other_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

I. If you were going to be or are going to be in this program again, what things would you like to have kept in the program?

II. If you were going to be or are going to be in the program again, what things would you like to see dropped or deleted from the program?

III. If you have any other ideas for this program would you put them here. If you have favorable feelings about this program, we would like to hear them too.

IV. Draw a picture of the thing you liked best in this program.